

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

I. Introduction

This Amendment is responsive to the Office Action mailed on April 21, 2005. A petition for a 1-month extension of time is attached so that the due date is to and including August 21, 2005.

In this Amendment, claims 50-72 are canceled, and claims 73-91 are added so that claims 73-91 are pending and subject to examination on the merits. Entry of this Amendment is requested.

Claims 50-57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Sheynblat et al. (US 6,677,894). Claims 58 and 60-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Sheynblat, and further in view of Pettovello (US 6,449,621). These rejections are moot in view of newly submitted claims 73-91. As explained in detail below, claims 73-91 are patentable over Sheynblat and Pettovello and other prior art of record.

II. New claims 73-91 Are Believed To Be Patentable over the Prior Art

Sheynblat et al.'s abstract discloses a method and apparatus for distribution of location-based information to a client which may be a user of a wireless phone. The client is requested to provide information related to the client's location. This information is transmitted to a Web server in order to determine the client's location and furnish information and services relevant to the client's location. Sheynblat et al.'s detailed description section describes one embodiment where the web server may use the client's location information to derive location/time distributions that may be useful for applications like customer profiling, location-targeted advertising, etc.

The basis of Sheynblat et al.'s teaching is active interaction of a client with a web server furnishing location-sensitive information and services. A particular client is forced to communicate with the web server either because of voluntary action or by request of the web server for a specific client when deemed necessary. Consequently, time/location distributions are limited, as being constructed around a limited number of wireless terminals and sporadic time intervals of location tracking, therefore failing to provide a basis for detection of behavioral patterns of interest.

Sheynblat et al. also fails to teach or suggest a method of detecting patterns of activity by passive monitoring of movements of each of a plurality of wireless terminals in a wireless network as stated in the independent claim 73.

The method, as formulated in claim 73 and in contrast to Sheynblat et al., does not require at the step of extracting network data to know the identity of a specific user of the wireless terminal. Consequently, detection of patterns is performed on the basis of each of a plurality of wireless terminals in the wireless network.

Sheynblat et al. fails to teach or suggest the use of network events generated by the wireless network as part of standard network communications processes not requiring specific user actions, e.g., periodic registration events. The method as formulated in claim 73 extracts "network event(s) periodically wherein the period of time intervals is

determined by characteristics of the wireless network” as recited in the independent claim 73 and thus independent from user actions.

Step of anonymization of location records formulated in claim 10 is taken in combination with the method formulated in claim 73 and claim 9 providing substitution of personal identifier with anonymous ones. Accordingly, Sheynblat et al. and Pettovello fail to teach or suggest the invention of claim 10.

III. Support For New Claims

Independent Claim 73

Support for the step of continuous extracting in the claim 73 can be found at least on page 16, lines 15-27 and page 17, lines 15-25, page 20 line 15.

Support for the step of extracting network events transmitted at periodic time intervals as formulated in claim 73 can be found at least from page 15, line 25 through page 16, line 5.

Support for the step of determining a position as formulated in claim 73 can be found at least on page 16, lines 5-20 and from page 19, line 25 through page 20, line 2.

Support for the step of formulating a position history can be found at least on page 5, lines 1-9, page 10 lines 11-17, page 23 lines 14-16.

Support for the step of determining whether any of formulated position histories as formulated in claim 73, can be found on at least page 10, lines 25-29, page 19 lines 15-20.

Claims 74-85

Support for claim 74 can be found at least on page 5, lines 1-9.

Support for claim 76 can be found at least on page 16, line 25.

Support for claim 80 can be found at least on page 24, lines 6-15.

Support for claim 85 can be found at least on page 4, lines 15-23, page 19, lines 15-20.

Support for “RF signals” in claim 79 can be found on page 15 line 15.

IV. Conclusion

In view of foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance, an indication of which is respectfully solicited. If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner’s amendment, the Examiner is requested to call Applicants at the telephone number shown below.



Appl. No. 09/778,108
Amdt. Dated August 18, 2005
Reply to Office Action of April 21, 2005

Respectfully submitted,
Profilium Inc.

Alexander Miller, CTO
Profilium Inc.
Tel: +1.514.397.1998
Mob: +1.514.815.5017
email: Alexander.Miller@profilium.com

Aaron DeMello

Alexandre Legendre

Gerald Host